

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/045,903	GOLDSTEIN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D.	1626	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application: 71**

(1) Laura L. Stockton, Ph.D.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Robert C. Hall (Reg. No. 39,209)

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 16 March 2005

**Time:** 1:43pm

**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No  
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:


Prior art documents discussed:

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**  
*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: A telephone call was made, and a voice mail message left, to Applicants' representative on Wednesday, March 16, 2005 @1:43pm to discuss 35 USC 112 issues. However, at the time of the attached Office Action, no return phone call had been made to the Examiner.

SS  
3/21/05